




COLLECTIONS SUMMARY FOR FORT DOUGLAS, UTAH

U.S. Army NAGPRA Compliance Project,
Technical Report No. 82



Prepared for the
U.S. Army Environmental Center,
Environmental Compliance Division

by the
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers,
St. Louis District,
*Mandatory Center of Expertise for the Curation and Management
of Archaeological Collections*

19990603 016

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE March 1996		3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Archaeological Collection Summary for Fort Douglas, Utah				5. FUNDING NUMBERS MIPR #8504	
6. AUTHOR(S) U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, St. Louis District Mandatory Center of Expertise for the Curation and Management of Archaeological Collections(MCX)					
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, St. Louis District, Mandatory Center of Expertise for the Curation and Management of Archaeological Collections (CELMS-PD-C) 1222 Spruce Street, St. Louis, MO 63103-2833				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER U.S. Army NAGPRA Compliance Project Technical Report 82	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Environmental Center Environmental Compliance Division (SFIM-AEC-ENC) Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21020-5401				10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER SFIM-AEC-EC-CR-96082	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES This research was supported in part by an appointment to the Research Participation Program at the St. Louis District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers administered by the Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education through an interagency agreement between the U.S. Department of Energy and the St. Louis District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.					
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release- distribution unlimited				12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) The U.S. Army Environmental Center tasked the Mandatory Center of Expertise for the Curation and Management of Archaeological Collections (MCX) with the job of assisting the Army with complying with the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), P.L.101-601. The MCX was asked to locate and assess archaeological collections derived from Army lands, to identify the Native American or Native Hawaiian organizations culturally affiliated with the collections, and to draft Section 6 Summary letters and Section 5 compliance documents for each installation. Archival research and telephone interviews with repository personnel were used to identify, locate, and assess the contents of the collections. A complete inventory of the human skeletal remains from Fort Douglas was conducted by the University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah, the results of which were used by the MCX to compile the Section 5 information. This report conveys the results of the research completed for compliance with Sections 5 and 6 of NAGPRA.					
14. SUBJECT TERMS archaeology; curation; cultural resources management; Native Americans; sacred objects; human remains.				15. NUMBER OF PAGES 33	
				16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UL		

**AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL COLLECTIONS SUMMARY
FOR
FORT DOUGLAS, UTAH**

**Information Provided for Compliance with the
Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act
Section 5 Inventory
and
Section 6 Summary Findings**

**Prepared for the
U.S. Army Environmental Center,
Environmental Compliance Division
Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland**

**By
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers,
St. Louis District,
Mandatory Center of Expertise for the
Curation and Management of Archaeological Collections,
U.S. Army NAGPRA Compliance Project,
Technical Report No. 82**

March 1996

CONTENTS

1	BACKGROUND.....	1
2	OBJECTIVES AND METHODS.....	2
3	RESEARCH RESULTS.....	3
	Archaeological Investigations at Fort Douglas.....	3
	Summary of NAGPRA-Related Items.....	4
	References to Archaeological Investigations.....	4
	Native American Tribes Associated with Fort Douglas.....	5
4	SECTION 6 COMPLIANCE.....	7
5	SECTION 5 COMPLIANCE.....	8
6	REFERENCES CITED.....	10
APPENDIX I	DRAFT SECTION 5 INITIAL CONSULTATION LETTER TO POTENTIALLY AFFILIATED TRIBES.....	13
APPENDIX II	DRAFT SECTION 5 INITIAL CONSULTATION LETTER TO GOSHUTE TRIBES.....	15
APPENDIX III	NATIVE AMERICAN POINTS OF CONTACT.....	17
APPENDIX IV	DRAFT NOTICE OF INVENTORY COMPLETION	20
APPENDIX V	DRAFT INVENTORY OF HUMAN REMAINS.....	22
APPENDIX VI	CURRENT LOCATION OF HUMAN REMAINS FROM FORT DOUGLAS.....	24

APPENDIX VII	MCX LIST OF REFERENCES.....	27
APPENDIX VIII	NADB LIST OF REFERENCES.....	32

BACKGROUND

The U.S. Army Environmental Center (AEC) tasked the Mandatory Center of Expertise for the Curation and Management of Archaeological Collections (MCX) with the job of assisting Army installation personnel in complying with the requirements of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (P.L. 101-601, NAGPRA). This law was enacted on 16 November 1990, and addresses the rights of lineal descendants, Indian tribes, Native Alaskan villages and corporations, and Native Hawaiian organizations to certain Native American human remains and cultural items with which they are affiliated. In summary, NAGPRA

- provides standards for intentional excavation and removal of Native American human remains and objects, and inadvertent discovery of Native American human remains and objects;

- requires each Federal agency and each museum that has possession or control over holdings or collections of Native American human remains and associated funerary objects to compile an inventory of such items and, to the extent possible, identify the geographical and cultural affiliation of such items. This was to be completed by 16 November 1995, and, not later than 6 months after completion of the inventory, the agency must notify all affected Indian tribes;

- requires each Federal agency or museum that has possession or control over holdings or collections of Native American unassociated funerary objects, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony to provide a written summary of such objects based upon available information held by such agency or museum which shall describe the scope of the collection, kinds of objects included, references to geographical location, means and period of acquisition, and cultural affiliation (where readily ascertainable). This was to be completed by 16 November 1993; and

- requires the Federal agency or museum - provided that cultural affiliation or control of Native American human remains, associated and unassociated funerary objects, sacred objects, and objects of cultural patrimony can be established - to expeditiously return such items to the known lineal descendants or affiliated tribe upon request.

The MCX was asked to locate and assess archaeological collections derived from Army-owned lands, to identify the federally recognized Native American tribes most likely to be culturally affiliated with the collections, to draft Section 6 Summary letters and Section 5 Initial Consultation letters for each installation, and to conduct physical inventories and draft compliance documents for any collections that contain human skeletal remains or funerary objects. This report conveys the results of the collections research completed to assist Fort Douglas in complying with the Section 6 Summary and Section 5 Inventory requirements of NAGPRA.

OBJECTIVES AND METHODS

The MCX used a two-stage process to identify, locate, and assess the contents of archaeological collections from the installation. First, archival research was performed to review all archaeological site records and reports for the installation. Second, telephone interviews were conducted with personnel at installations, universities, museums, and archaeological contractors that were identified during the archival research as possible repositories of Army collections. The MCX did not physically verify the existence of collections and, as such, the information contained in this report is based on background record reviews and information obtained via telephone interviews with the aforementioned installation personnel and institution professionals.

Archival research for Fort Douglas began with a search of the National Archeological Data Base (NADB) for references pertaining to the installation. This was followed by a thorough examination of all archaeological site forms and a literature review of all pertinent archaeological reports and manuscripts on file at the Utah Division of State History, Salt Lake City, Utah. The records search was performed in October 1995, and sought to identify any work on the installation that may have produced archaeological collections.

Subsequent telephone interviews to potential collections repositories ascertained whether the materials were present and the range of objects in each collection. Once the collections were located and assessed, MCX personnel identified federally recognized Native American tribes that are likely to be culturally affiliated with the materials in the collections. Draft *Section 5 Initial Consultation Letters* (Appendices I & II) are enclosed for these tribes, as well as a listing of the current tribal chairpersons (Appendix III). Drafts of the *Notice of Inventory Completion* (Appendix IV) and the *Inventory of Human Remains* (Appendix V) have been prepared by the MCX for compliance purposes.

Information obtained and reported by the MCX concerning Section 5 Inventory materials is derived from the aforementioned sources and is not the result of direct consultation with any Native American tribes or members. Consultation is the responsibility of the installation. Information from the installation consultation with culturally affiliated tribes (Appendix III) should be incorporated by installation personnel into the final compliance documents prior to submission to the Departmental Consulting Archaeologist at the National Park Service, or to potentially affiliated tribes. Consultation should begin as soon as possible. The MCX stands ready to supply additional detail or background to the inventory, at the request of installations.

RESEARCH RESULTS

ARCHAEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS AT FORT DOUGLAS

Fort Douglas was established as a U.S. Army Post 26 October 1862 (Waldman 1988:221; telephone conversation with Jess McCall, Curator, Fort Douglas Military Museum, 7 November 1995). The post underwent BRAC procedures in 1992, and at that time, all remaining lands were transferred to Utah State National Guard (U.S. Army Real Property 1992; telephone conversation with Jess McCall, 12 October 1995).

Despite Army occupation for 130 years, there have been no known professional archaeological investigations conducted on this installation that have resulted in the documentation of prehistoric cultural resources. The United States Forest Service conducted a survey for a parking lot expansion in 1988 that resulted in a negative finding status. Another investigation was noted only as a project number (87-LN-615) on a U.S.G.S. quadrangle map on file with Utah Division of State History. No further information could be found that corresponded to the latter project. Most of the references contained in the National Archeological Data Base indicate that archaeological work on Fort Douglas has consisted of historic property inventories, and none of the reports listed with NADB are on file with Utah Division of State History.

However, background research conducted by the MCX indicated that Native American human remains had been removed from lands occupied by Fort Douglas. A single prehistoric Native American burial, 42SL30, was discovered inadvertently during construction activities in the basement of an officer's home on the post in 1939. This burial site is the only known cultural resource on Fort Douglas. Skeletal remains recovered from the burial are currently housed at the Utah Museum of Natural History (UNMH), University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah. A detailed inventory and assessment of these remains has been conducted by the staff physical anthropologist at Utah Museum of Natural History, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah, for cataloging purposes. This inventory was done without the knowledge or request of Fort Douglas personnel. No Native American tribal representatives were notified of, or included in, this inventory process.

Information gathered as a result of the physical inspection of the remains by UMNH staff was then compared with the data gathered from the MCX's inspection of the associated collection documentation, as well as the data collected from the reports and site forms generated during the Section 6 Summary research. Discrepancies were noted and reconciled when possible. The final item-by-item list (Appendix V) of human remains required by NAGPRA is based on these findings.

There may be additional prehistoric and historic collections located at the Fort Douglas Military Museum that were made on Fort Douglas lands. If this is the case, related site records have not been forwarded to the Utah Division of State History for inclusion in their site files. The Fort Douglas Military Museum is a Center for Military History Museum, and as such, they will comply with NAGPRA requirements for any collections held by them (telephone conversation with Jess McCall, 21 September 1995).

SUMMARY OF NAGPRA-RELATED ITEMS

The skeletal remains of one individual and a page of field notes have been identified as being collected from Fort Douglas. These remains and associated documentation are located at the Utah Museum of Natural History, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah. A complete inventory of these remains was conducted in 1996 by Shannon Novack, staff physical anthropologist at UMNH, for cataloging purposes (telephone conversation with Kathy Kankainen, Collections Manager, UMNH, 18 October 1995). The results of this inventory were used by the MCX to compile the draft NAGPRA Section 5 Compliance documents (Appendices IV & V).

The Fort Douglas burial has been assigned UMNH burial number 171 and accession number 14441. The original field notes stated that the burial was that of an "adult male over the age of thirty" with "70% of the bones found during excavation in a fair state of preservation," and "acquired by E. (Elmer) R. Smith in 1939." This burial is also known as the "burial found in the basement of Sgt. Poole's house." Information obtained during the inventory conducted by staff at UMNH indicates that this burial is in fact that of a robust female, and is believed to date to the Archaic (about 7,000 B.C. to 800 A.D.) period (telephone conversation with Kathy Kankainen, 18 October 1995 {the above quotes were transcribed as Ms. Kankainen read them from the field notes}; Novack 1996). No artifacts were reported in association with, or near, the burial. The attached *Current Location of Remains from Fort Douglas* (Appendix VI) provides additional information about the burial.

REFERENCES TO ARCHAEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS

Two sets of references regarding archaeological work conducted on Fort Douglas are attached: Appendix VII contains the list of references reviewed by the MCX during its archival research. Appendix VIII is the list of references contained in the National Archeological Data Base (NADB).

NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES ASSOCIATED WITH FORT DOUGLAS

Fort Douglas is located within the northwest quarter of the state of Utah. The human remains collected from this installation have been determined to date to the Archaic period (about 7000 B.C. to 800 A.D.) and were not found in association with any cultural objects (telephone conversation with Kathy Kankainen, 18 October 1995). Since the Archaic period is a continent wide archaeological culture period with no known distinctly identifiable ties to any one modern tribe, it is unlikely that a specific tribal affiliation can be assigned to these remains. However, a review of the available literature seems to demonstrate ethnographically, linguistically, and/or archaeologically, that the Northern Shoshone, Western Shoshone, Eastern Shoshone, and Ute have had both historic and prehistoric ties (since the Paleo-Indian period ended around 7,000 B.C.) to the general geographical area in which the Fort Douglas remains were discovered. (Holmer and Ringe 1986; d'Azevedo 1986:8; Fowler 1986:21; Cressman 1986:126; Madsen and Rhode 1994).

The Northern Shoshone, Western Shoshone, Eastern Shoshone, and Ute all appear to have aboriginal territories that fall within the Great Basin culture area, which has the unique distinction of being the last area to be impacted by westward Euro-American expansion. No fewer than 39 treaties have been made between the United States government and various Great Basin tribes and bands between 1846 and 1906. The contents of these treaties, which variably included presents, peace, friendship, concessions, annuities, procurement rights, removals, reservations, and allotments, were largely ignored on both sides (Clemmer and Stewart 1986:526). In the end, however, many bands simply refused to leave their homelands. This tenacity by the bands finally resulted in the establishment of numerous small rancherias and colonies (located predominately on the outskirts of Euro-American settlements after 1900) in addition to any treaty-specified reservation lands (Crum 1994:593; Fowler 1994:422). The modern descendants of Great Basin tribes and bands, therefore, have experienced very little diffusion from their aboriginal territories, and remain culturally and politically distinct despite obvious linguistic similarities and extensive intertribal contact (Terrell 1971; Liljeblad and Fowler 1986; Thomas *et al.* 1986; Fowler and Liljeblad 1986).

Any general cultural divisions among Shoshone groups have often been based on criteria such as food procurement activities and local territories. The Indians themselves made no recognition of Northern, Western, or Eastern groups in the ethnographic record. All Shoshonean bands speak mutually intelligible dialects of the northern branch of the Numic language. Annual food migrations often resulted in heavy population drift, although most bands tended to conduct their seasonal rounds within the same territories year after year. The results of these linguistic similarities and food procurement patterns were that Shoshonean bands tended to blend and merge with each other. Although some Northern Shoshone bands tended to be larger and more organized than typical Numic bands, they were also more fluid and open than neighboring Plains tribes, making delineation of area subgroups and territories difficult at best (Murphy and Murphy 1986:284).

"No boundaries, as such, can be drawn between the Northern Shoshone and those Shoshone to the south in Utah and Nevada. Similarly, the distinction between Eastern and Northern Shoshone rests entirely on respective loci of activity and not upon cultural grounds or fixed social memberships in social groups." (Murphy and Murphy 1986:287).

It is these "loci of activity," and the individual bands' attachment to these areas, that has resulted in the Shoshonean groups' modern locations approximating their aboriginal territories. Modern territories of the Shoshone are identified by Loether (1994:589) as follows: The Western Shoshone live mostly in colonies, rancherias, and reservations in the states of Nevada, Utah, California, and Idaho, some of which they share with the Owens Valley Paiute or the Washoe. Tribes near the Utah-Nevada and Idaho-Utah borders on the Utah side of those boundaries are known as the Goshute, who are also considered a Western Shoshone band (Murphy-Reed 1994:595). The Northern Shoshone, along with the Lemhi (Sheepeater Shoshone) band, and a Northern Paiute band known as the Bannock Creek people, reside mostly on the Fort Hall Indian Reservation in Idaho, near the Utah border. Eastern Shoshone bands were noted by Shimkin (1986:308) as having migrated into the Plains Culture area from present day Wyoming in the 1500s. They now reside on the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming, where they apparently returned in the 1800s to escape pressure by Euro-American settlers.

Immediately along the northeastern boundary of the Shoshonean territory are the Ute, who are believed to have aboriginally occupied large portions of Utah, most of Colorado, and a small area in northern New Mexico. The Weeminuche band, whose territory historically extended westward into the canyon lands of Utah, are now known as the Ute Mountain Ute of Colorado. The Uncompaghre of central and eastern Colorado were forced to sell their land and move to the Ouray Reservation in eastern Utah in 1880. The White River band of the Ute was forcibly relocated from Colorado to the Uintah reservation in northeastern Utah after they participated in the Meeker Massacre in the late 1800s (Callaway and Endter-Wada 1994:672). The Ute bands speak mutually intelligible dialects of the southern branch of the Numic language, and have remained a distinct cultural entity from their Shoshonean neighbors, despite extensive interaction with the Goshute Shoshone bands (Callaway *et al.* 1986:336).

The area encompassing Fort Douglas is near the convergence of the adjudicated boundaries for the three Shoshonean groups and the Ute. The Goshute Shoshone tribe have been adjudicated the lands on which Fort Douglas currently resides (U.S.G.S. n.d.). Various other tribes and bands of the Western Shoshone, as well as tribes and bands of the Northern Shoshone, the Eastern Shoshone, and the Ute have been adjudicated lands near the present location of Fort Douglas (U.S.G.S. n.d.; U.S.G.S. 1992). There are fifteen federally recognized tribes and bands (Appendix III) whose modern land occupation is within their approximate aboriginal territories and presently located within a reasonable geographic distance (approximately a 300-mile radius) of the burial site on Fort Douglas.

SECTION 6 COMPLIANCE

P.L. 101-601 (NAGPRA) requires that federal agencies engage in active consultation with Native Americans federally recognized tribes and/or lineal descendants who may be culturally affiliated with archaeological collections from the installation. No archaeological collections were identified for Fort Douglas during MCX's investigations, and as such, our findings under Section 6 are negative for this installation.

However, since Native American human remains have been identified for Fort Douglas, the installation is required to comply with Section 5 of NAGPRA. Additionally, should any Native American human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony be intentionally excavated or inadvertently discovered in the future, the installation must comply with Section 3 of NAGPRA.

Initial consultation should be conducted on a government-to-government basis. Refer to P.L. 101-601 and 43 CFR 10 Part 10 (Implementing Regulations) for specifics on required Native American consultation and the legal definition of items subject to NAGPRA.

SECTION 5 COMPLIANCE

P.L. 101-601 (NAGPRA) requires that federal agencies complete their Section 5 compliance in consultation with tribal governments, traditional religious leaders, and/or lineal descendants who may be affiliated with human remains and/or funerary objects from the installation. Appendix III includes a list of the Native American tribal chairpersons from the federally recognized tribes which may be culturally affiliated with the human remains from Fort Douglas. Also enclosed are the draft *Notice of Inventory Completion* (Appendix IV) and the draft *Section 5 Inventory* (Appendix V) required by NAGPRA. These two separate documents comprise the Section 5 Inventory required by NAGPRA as stated in 43 CFR Part 10; Final Rule:

- (1) A listing of all human remains and associated funerary objects that are identified as being culturally affiliated with one or more present-day Indian tribes or Native Hawaiian organizations. The list must indicate - for each item or set of items - whether cultural affiliation is clearly determined or likely based upon the preponderance of the evidence; and
- (2) A listing of all culturally unidentifiable human remains and associated funerary objects for which no culturally affiliated present-day Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization can be determined.

This report does not contain a final cultural affiliation determination. The draft *Section 5 Inventory* contained herein (Appendix V) enumerates all items in one document. However, installation personnel should determine final cultural affiliation - or lack thereof - through consultation, then construct one of the two documents referenced above. Installation personnel should amend any cultural affiliation information in the inventory documents (Appendices IV & V) that may have changed as a result of consultation with Native American tribes or lineal descendants. Italics were used in both compliance documents to indicate where information must be added or amended.

Additionally, preliminary cultural affiliation information listed in this report includes those tribes for which affiliation is likely, but not clear. This includes tribes who were adjudicated land by judicial process before the Indian Claims Commission, and those tribes that were shown by bibliographic references to have been historically in the area.

Upon consultation with tribal representatives, installation personnel should investigate the preliminary cultural affiliation determination, and, given the results of the consultation, should determine if there is a clear cultural affiliation or likely affiliation. If, through

consultation, no federally-recognized tribe or lineal descendant can be identified as being culturally affiliated with the remains, then those remains should be listed as unidentifiable (reference No. 2 above), and the list should be sent to the Departmental Consulting Archaeologist.

Final cultural affiliation must be determined by the installation through consultation with Native Americans. Before distribution to tribes, the final compliance documents (Appendix IV & V) must include the installation's cultural affiliation determinations and results of the consultation process in the appropriate areas, as highlighted by italics.

To assist the installation in this determination, the MCX has tentatively identified eleven tribes and four additional constituent bands of the Te-Moak tribe (who are considered separate entities) that are federally recognized (Bureau of Indian Affairs 1995), and who may be culturally or biologically affiliated with the remains from Fort Douglas:

Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Reservation, Nevada and Utah
Duckwater Shoshone Tribe of the Duckwater Reservation, Nevada
Ely Shoshone Tribe of Nevada
Northwest Band of the Shoshoni Nation of Utah (Washakie)
Shoshone Tribe of the Wind River Reservation, Wyoming
Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, Idaho
Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Reservation, Nevada
Skull Valley Band of the Goshute Indians of Utah
Te-Moak Tribes of the Western Shoshone Indians of Nevada

(Constituent Bands):

Battle Mountain Band
Elko Band
South Fork Band
Wells Indian Colony Band
Ute Indians of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, Utah
Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah

Initial consultation should be conducted on a government-to-government basis. Refer to P.L. 101-601 (NAGPRA) and 43 CFR 10 Final Rule for specifics on required Native American consultation and the legal definitions of items subject to NAGPRA.

REFERENCES CITED

Bureau of Indian Affairs

- 1995 Bureau of Indian Affairs Indian Entities Recognized and Eligible to Receive Services from the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs. *Federal Register*, Volume 60, No. 32, Part IV, February 16, 1995.

Callaway, Donald G. and Joanna Endter-Wada

- 1994 Ute. In *Native America in the Twentieth Century: An Encyclopedia*, edited by Mary B. Davis, pp. 672-680. Garland Publishing, Inc. New York and London.

Callaway, Donald, Joel Janetski and Omer C Stewart

- 1986 Ute. In, Great Basin, edited by Warren L. d'Azevedo, pp. 336-367. *Handbook of North American Indians*, Volume 11, William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Clemmer, Richard O. and Omer Stewart

- 1986 Treaties, Reservations, and Claims. In, Great Basin, edited by Warren L. d'Azevedo, pp. 525-557. *Handbook of North American Indians*, Volume 11, William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Crum, Stephen J.

- 1994 Western Shoshone. In *Native America in the Twentieth Century: An Encyclopedia*, edited by Mary B. Davis, pp. 593-595. Garland Publishing, Inc. New York and London.

Cressman, Luther S.

- 1986 Prehistory of the Northern Area. In, Great Basin, edited by Warren L. d'Azevedo, pp.120-126. *Handbook of North American Indians*, Volume 11, William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

d'Azevedo, Warren L.

- 1986 Introduction. In, Great Basin, edited by Warren L. d'Azevedo, pp. 1-14. *Handbook of North American Indians*, Volume 11, William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Fowler, Catherine S.

- 1994 Paiute. In *Native America in the Twentieth Century: An Encyclopedia*, edited by Mary B. Davis, pp. 422-426. Garland Publishing, Inc. New York and London.

Fowler, Catherine S. and Sven Liljeblad

- 1986 Northern Paiute. In, Great Basin, edited by Warren L. d'Azevedo, pp. 435-465. *Handbook of North American Indians*, Volume 11, William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Fowler, Don D.

- 1986 History of Research. In, Great Basin, edited by Warren L. d'Azevedo, pp. 15-30. *Handbook of North American Indians*, Volume 11, William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Holmer, Richard N. and Brenda Ringe

- 1986 Excavations at Wahmuza. In Shoshone-Bannock Culture History, edited by Richard N. Homer. *Swanson/Crabtree Anthropological Research Laboratory Report of Investigations* 85-16:39-203, Idaho State University, Pocatello, Idaho.

Liljeblad, Sven and Catherine S. Fowler

- 1986 Owens Valley Paiute. In, Great Basin, edited by Warren L. d'Azevedo, pp. 412-434. *Handbook of North American Indians*, Volume 11, William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Loether, Christopher

- 1994 Shoshone-Bannock. In *Native America in the Twentieth Century: An Encyclopedia*, edited by Mary B. Davis, pp. 591-592. Garland Publishing, Inc. New York and London.

Madsen, David B. and David Rhode (Editors)

- 1994 *Across the West: Human Population Movement and the Expansion of the Numa*. University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Murphy, Robert F. and Yolanda Murphy

- 1986 Northern Shoshone and Bannock. In, Great Basin, edited by Warren L. d'Azevedo, pp. 284-307. *Handbook of North American Indians*, Volume 11, William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Murphy-Reed, Chrissandra

- 1994 Goshute. In *Native America in the Twentieth Century: An Encyclopedia*, edited by Mary B. Davis, pp. 595-596. Garland Publishing, Inc. New York and London.

Novack, Shannon

- 1996 *Letter Report and Inventory: 14441-171 (42SL30)*. Utah Museum of Natural History, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Shimkin, Demitri B.

- 1986 Eastern Shoshone. In, Great Basin, edited by Warren L. d'Azevedo, pp. 308-335. *Handbook of North American Indians*, Volume 11, William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Terrell, John Upton

- 1971 *American Indian Almanac*. The World Publishing Company, New York, New York.

Thomas, David H., Lorann S. A. Pendleton and Stephen C. Cappannari

- 1986 Western Shoshone. In, Great Basin, edited by Warren L. d'Azevedo, pp. 262-283. *Handbook of North American Indians*, Volume 11, William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

United States Geological Survey

- n.d. *Indian Land Areas Judicially Established 1978*. Map prepared by the United States Geological Survey for the Indian Claims Commission.

United States Geological Survey

- 1992 *Indian Land Areas*. Map compiled by the Handbook of North American Indians (Smithsonian Institution) in cooperation with the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Prepared by the United States Geological Survey.

Waldman, Carl

- 1988 *Encyclopedia of Native American Tribes*. Facts on File Publications, New York, New York.

APPENDIX I

DRAFT SECTION 5 INITIAL CONSULTATION LETTER TO POTENTIALLY AFFILIATED TRIBES NOT ADJUDICATED LANDS ON FORT DOUGLAS, UTAH

[Installation Header]

[Tribal POC Name]

[Title]

[Address]

[City, State, Zip]

Dear [Name of POC]:

I am writing to inform you of human remains held by Fort Douglas that may, as defined by the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), be affiliated with the [tribe/band]. Fort Douglas has documented these remains in an inventory in accordance with the requirements of Section 5 of NAGPRA. No other archaeological collections have been identified for Fort Douglas, and as such, our report under Section 6 is negative.

Fort Douglas is responsible for one prehistoric Native American burial and related field documentation. No objects were reported to have been found in association with or near the burial, which was discovered inadvertently during construction activities in the basement of an officer's home on the post in 1939. These remains and associated field notes are located at the George Thomas Building, Utah Museum of Natural History, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah, where the remains underwent a physical inventory by the University of Utah staff physical anthropologist for cataloging purposes without the knowledge or request of Fort Douglas personnel. Information obtained during this inventory indicates that the remains date to the Archaic period (about 7,000 B.C. to 800 A.D.).

The northwesterly located Western Shoshone tribes, the Northern Shoshone tribes, the Eastern Shoshone tribes, and the northern most Ute tribes are being notified because these remains were found in or near areas thought to be part of the territory occupied or used aboriginally by these tribes or their ancestors. Upon your written request, we will provide you access to review our records, catalogues, relevant studies, or other pertinent data for the purpose of determining the geographic origin, cultural affiliation, and basic facts surrounding acquisition and accession of these remains. In order to consult with us regarding this matter, please respond in writing as soon as possible after receipt of this letter.

Please feel free to contact Dell Greek regarding any of these issues, at [telephone, address].

To facilitate discussions between Fort Douglas and the [tribe/band] on these matters, please forward the name and method of contacting your tribal representative, traditional religious leader, or preferred NAGPRA point of contact. We look forward to working with you.

Sincerely,

[Commander's signature]

CF:	USARC	HQ, U.S. Army Reserve ATTN: AFRC-ENV-RC (Carl Divinyi) 3800 N Camp Creek Pkwy SW Fort McPherson, GA 30331-5099
	USAEC	Commander, US Army Environmental Center ATTN: SFIM-AEC-EC (Guldenzopf) Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21010-5401
	MCX	Commander, US Army Corps of Engineers ATTN: CELMS-PD-C (Trimble) 1222 Spruce Street St. Louis, MO 63103-2833

APPENDIX II

DRAFT SECTION 5 INITIAL CONSULTATION LETTER TO GOSHUTE SHOSHONE TRIBES FOR FORT DOUGLAS, UTAH

[Installation Header]

[Tribal POC Name]

[Title]

[Address]

[City, State, Zip]

Dear [Name of POC]:

I am writing to inform you of human remains held by Fort Douglas that may, as defined by the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), be affiliated with the Goshute. Fort Douglas has documented these remains in an inventory in accordance with the requirements of Section 5 of NAGPRA. No other archaeological collections have been identified for Fort Douglas, and as such, our report under Section 6 is negative.

Fort Douglas is responsible for one prehistoric Native American burial and related field documentation. No objects were reported to have been found in association with or near the burial, which was discovered inadvertently during construction activities in the basement of an officer's home on the post in 1939. These remains and associated field notes are located at the George Thomas Building, Utah Museum of Natural History, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah, where the remains underwent a physical inventory by the University of Utah staff physical anthropologist for cataloging purposes without the knowledge or request of Fort Douglas personnel. Information obtained during this inventory indicates that the remains date to the Archaic period (about 7,000 B.C. to 800 A.D.).

All of the northwesterly located Western Shoshone tribes, the Northern Shoshone tribes, the Eastern Shoshone tribes, and the northern most Ute tribes are also being notified because these remains were found in areas thought to be part of the territory occupied or used aboriginally by these tribes or their ancestors. The Goshute may, in accordance with Section 5 of NAGPRA, wish to consult with us regarding these remains because of the geographical location of the burial site, which is within the area adjudicated by the Indian Land Claims Commission as the aboriginal territory of the Goshute tribe.

Upon your written request, we will provide you access to review our records, catalogues, relevant studies, or other pertinent data for the purpose of determining the geographic origin, cultural affiliation, and basic facts surrounding acquisition and accession of these remains. In order to consult with us regarding this matter, please respond in writing as soon as possible after receipt of this letter.

Please feel free to contact Dell Greek regarding any of these issues, at [telephone, address].

To facilitate discussions between Fort Douglas and the Goshute on these matters, please forward the name and method of contacting your tribal representative, traditional religious leader, or preferred NAGPRA point of contact. We look forward to working with you.

Sincerely,

[Commander's signature]

CF: USARC	HQ, U.S. Army Reserve ATTN: AFRC-ENV-RC (Carl Divinyi) 3800 N Camp Creek Pkwy SW Fort McPherson, GA 30331-5099
USAEC	Commander, US Army Environmental Center ATTN: SFIM-AEC-EC (Guldenzopf) Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21010-5401
MCX	Commander, US Army Corps of Engineers ATTN: CELMS-PD-C (Trimble) 1222 Spruce Street St. Louis, MO 63103-2833

APPENDIX III

NATIVE AMERICAN POINTS OF CONTACT FOR FORT DOUGLAS, UTAH

FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED TRIBES

Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Reservation:

Harlen Pete, Chairman
Goshute Business Council
P.O. Box 6104
Ibapah, Utah 84034
(801) 243-1136
(801) 234-6211 FAX

Duckwater Shoshone Tribe:

Boyd Graham, Chairman
Duckwater Shoshone Tribal Council
P.O. Box 140068
Duckwater, Nevada 89314
(702) 863-0227
(702) 863-0301 FAX

Ely Shoshone Tribe:

Jerry Charles, Chairman
Ely Colony Council
16 Shoshone Circle
Ely, Nevada 89301
(702) 289-3013
(702) 289-3156 FAX

Northwestern Band of the Shoshone Nation of Utah:

George Worley, Chairman
Northwestern Band of Shoshone Nation
P.O. Box 637
Blackfoot, Idaho 83221
(208) 785-7401
(208) 785-2206 FAX

Shoshone Tribe of the Wind River Reservation:

Alfred Ward, Chairman
Shoshone Business Council
P.O. Box 217
Blackfoot, Idaho 83221
(208) 785-7401
(208) 785-2206 FAX

Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of Fort Hall Reservation:

Marvin Osborne, Chairman
Fort Hall Business Council
P.O. Box 306
Fort Hall, Idaho 83203-0306
(208) 238-3700
(208) 237-0797 FAX

Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of Duck Valley Reservation:

Lindsey Manning, Chairman
Shoshone Paiute Business Council
P.O. Box 219
Owyhee, Nevada 89832
(702) 757-3161
(702) 757-2219 FAX

Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians of Utah:

Lawrence Bear, Chairman
Skull Valley General Council
Grantsville, Utah 84029
(801) 831-6126
(801) 722-2406 FAX

Te-Moak Tribes of Western Shoshone Indians:

Dale S. Malotte, Chairman
Tribal Council of the Te-Moak Western Tribes
525 Sunset Street
Elko, Nevada 89801
(702) 738-9251
(702) 738-2345 FAX

Constituent Bands of the Te-Moak Tribe of Western Shoshone Indians:

Paul Snooks, Chairman
Battle Mountain Band Council
35 Mountain View Drive, #138-13
Battle Mountain, Nevada 89820
(702) 635-2004
(702) 635-8016 FAX

Davis Gonzales, Chairman
Elko Band Council
P.O. Box 748
Elko, Nevada 89801
(702) 738-8889
(702) 753-5439 FAX

Stillman Knight, Jr., Chairman
South Fork Band Council
Box B-13
Lee, Nevada 89829
(702) 744-4273

Bruce Stevens, Chairman
Wells Indian Colony Band Council
P.O. Box 809
Wells, Nevada 89835
(702) 752-3045

Ute Indians of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation:

Stewart Pike, Chairman
Uintah and Ouray Tribal Business Council
P.O. Box 190
Fort Duchesne, Utah 84026
(801) 722-5141
(801) 722-2374 FAX

Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation:

Judy Knight-Frank, Chairperson
General Delivery
Towaoc, Colorado 81334
(303) 565-3751
(303) 565-7412 FAX

APPENDIX IV

DRAFT NOTICE OF INVENTORY COMPLETION FOR SITE #42SL30, FORT DOUGLAS, UTAH

Section 5 Inventory Compliance Document

[Italicized sections should be replaced with information gained through consultation with culturally affiliated federally recognized tribes].

In accordance with NAGPRA and 43 CFR 10.9, notice is hereby given of completion of the inventory of human remains from Fort Douglas, Utah, that are presently in the control of Fort Douglas.

The partial remains of one adult female were recovered during construction activities in the basement of an officer's home on Fort Douglas in 1939. No artifacts were reported in association with, or near, the burial. The remains were acquired by E. (Elmer) R. Smith, who was affiliated with Utah Museum of Natural History, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah, at the time of the acquisition. The remains have been in the physical possession of UMNH since that time.

A detailed inventory and assessment of these remains was made by a physical anthropologist at the University of Utah, and reviewed by a physical anthropologist at the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, St. Louis District, Mandatory Center of Expertise for the Curation and Management of Archaeological Collections, U.S. Army installation staff, and representatives of the *[tribes that were consulted]*.

The remains collected from Fort Douglas have been determined to date to the Archaic period (about 7000 B.C. to 800 A.D.). Various physical attributes of the remains as well as the original burial location were used to make this determination.

Since the Archaic period is a continent-wide archaeological culture period with no known distinctly identifiable ties to any one modern tribe, it is unlikely that a specific tribal affiliation can be assigned to these remains. However, a review of the available literature seems to demonstrate ethnographically and/or archaeologically that the Northern Shoshone, the Western Shoshone, the Eastern Shoshone, and the Ute have had both historic and prehistoric ties to the general geographical area in which the Fort Douglas remains were discovered since the Paleo-Indian Period ended around 7,000 B.C.

According to the Indian Land Areas Judicially Established 1978 U.S.G.S. map and the U.S.G.S. Indian Land Areas map (1992), the area encompassing Fort Douglas falls near the convergence of the adjudicated boundaries for the three Shoshonean groups and the Ute.

The Goshute Shoshone tribe have been adjudicated the lands on which Fort Douglas currently resides. Various other tribes and bands of the Western Shoshone, as well as tribes and bands of the Northern Shoshone, the Eastern Shoshone, and the Ute have been adjudicated lands near the present location of Fort Douglas. There are fifteen federally recognized tribes and bands whose modern land occupation is within their approximate aboriginal territories and presently located within a reasonable geographic distance (approximately a 300-mile radius) of the burial site on Fort Douglas.

Based on the above information, officials of the U.S. Army have determined that, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 3001(a), there is a relationship of shared group identity which can be reasonably traced between these remains and the *[tribes/bands or lineal descendant name(s)]* OR *[there is no relationship of shared group identity which can reasonably be traced between these human remains and a lineal descendant or federally recognized Native American, Native Alaskan, or Native Hawaiian tribe nation]*.

This notice has been sent to officials of the following *[tribes/bands]*:

Representatives of any other Indian tribe which believes itself to be culturally affiliated with these human remains should contact *[installation POC]* before *[date of 30 days past publication date]*. Repatriation of these human remains to the *[tribe/band]* may begin after that date if no additional claimants come forward.

APPENDIX V

DRAFT INVENTORY OF HUMAN REMAINS FOR SITE #42SL30, FORT DOUGLAS, UTAH

Section 5 Inventory Compliance Document

Item: Human remains.

Locator: Human Remains Room, Box 37, George Thomas Building (Utah Museum of Natural History), University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Catalog #: Accession No. 14441

Burial #: 171

Description: Adult female, likely 45 to 49 years of age at time of death. Approximately 70% of the bones were present when discovered: a nearly intact cranium and portions of the mandible, seventeen vertebrae, left humerus, right humerus, left innominate, right innominate, left femur, right femur, left tibia, right tibia, and right fibula. Numerous skeletal pathologies were identified during the assessment of these remains, including a well healed depression fracture of the left parietal area near the sagittal suture (*Letter Report and Inventory for 14441-171 (42SL30)* by Shannon Novack dated 16 January 1996).

Geographic Location: Discovered during construction activities in the basement of an officer's home on the post in 1939 (Sgt. Poole's house), the remains were acquired that same year by E. (Elmer) R. Smith, a staff member of the Utah Museum of Natural History and the University of Utah Department of Anthropology.

Cultural Affiliation: Archaic - "The morphology of the cranium and the location of the burial suggests that this individual is Archaic. The cranial vault is very low, long, and narrow. The fragmentary occipital bone exhibits a bun and prominent nuchal lines. These are all characteristics exhibited by most early Archaic crania in this region and outside the Great Basin. The long bones are long with fairly pronounced muscle attachments." (*Letter Report and Inventory for 14441-171 (42SL30)* by Shannon Novack dated 16 January 1996). *[Likely Shoshonean ancestor based on the following evidence: The Goshute Shoshone Band have been adjudicated lands on what is currently Fort Douglas. Other tribes that are likely to be culturally affiliated included the Northern, Eastern, and Western Shoshone as well as the northern most Ute tribes based on*

aboriginal land claims. {Add any cultural affiliation information gathered during consultation or amend the existing cultural affiliation if needed}}].

Note:

Also referred to as the "Sgt. Poole Burial." The remains were inventoried by Shannon Novack of Utah Museum of Natural History for cataloging purposes. During this inventory it was discovered that the long bones had been previously cut for removal of thin sections, which are commonly used in microscopic analysis. Ms. Novack believes that this process was done in the 1970s by Dr. George R. Armelagos, who conducted research on all of Utah Museum of Natural History's human skeletal holdings during this time period. Apparently, the thin sections were used for osteon counts, which are used to help determine the age of a bone. Dr. Armelagos took his research with him when he left, and current staff has no access to any of his research results. Dr. Armelagos is believed to be with Emory University, Florida, at this time.

APPENDIX VI

CURRENT LOCATION OF HUMAN REMAINS FROM FORT DOUGLAS, UTAH

All collections information has been entered into a Paradox data base file and can be queried by any of the fields listed below, as well as by the name of the installation and by MACOM. The data base will be delivered by the MCX to the U.S. Army Environmental Center upon completion of the U.S. Army NAGPRA Compliance Project. Inquiries for additional information are welcome (MCX: 314-331-8865; U.S. Army Environmental Center NAGPRA Compliance Project: 410-671-1573). The data fields listed in the summary of collections contain the following information:

REPOSITORY:	The current location in which the collection is stored, as of the date of this report.
REPOSITORY POC:	The person contacted by the MCX, or the person to whom inquiries regarding the collection should be addressed.
TELEPHONE:	The telephone number for the repository POC.
COLLECTION ID:	The identifying unit used by the repository to store and/or locate the collection. This can be a unique accession number assigned by the repository, the archaeological site number or project name, the name of the collector of the collection, or another number or name assigned by the repository.
SITE NUMBERS:	The official site number or name only for those sites from which materials were collected. An investigator may have performed work at additional sites but did not collect any materials. Those site numbers are not included in this field.
FIELDWORK DATES:	The date(s) during which the investigation(s) occurred. This information is provided to differentiate between projects that may have investigated the same site repeatedly.
EXCAVATOR/COLLECTOR:	The individual and/or organization that conducted the investigation.

COLLECTION SIZE: The volume or number of objects in a collection, estimated by the repository POC or from project reports.

DESCRIPTION OF MATERIALS: General material classes of the objects in the collection derived from data provided on site records, in references, and/or by the Repository POC.

ANTIQUITY/ARCH. PERIOD: Chronological or cultural-historical designations recorded on site records or in references specific to the collection.

CULTURAL AFFILIATION: This column contains only those ethnic identifications found in the site records or references specific to the collection. This field is left blank if no such information was recorded.

BASIS OF DETERMINATION: Documents the source of the cultural affiliation information (e.g., site record, oral testimony, reference).

SECTION 5 MATERIALS: Describes the number and kind of human skeletal remains and associated funerary objects in the collection, as indicated by the site records, references, repository management documents, or information from repository POC. If these materials are present or are suspected to be present, NAGPRA Section 5 requires a physical inventory of the materials.

Summary of Current Location of Archaeological Collections From: f

As of March 1996

Repository	Repository POC	Telephone	Collection ID	Site Numbers	Fieldwork Dates	Excavator/Collector
George Thomas Building, Utah Museum of Natural History (UMNH), University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah	Kathy Kankainen	(801) 581-3876	Burial # UMNH 171; Accession #14441	42SL30	1939	E.R. Smith

Summary of Current Location of Archaeological Collections From: Fort Douglas, Utah [FORSCOM]

As of March 1996

Site Numbers	Fieldwork Dates	Excavator/Collector	Collection Size	Description of Materials	Antiquity/Archaeological Period
30	1939	E.R. Smith	1 Individual, 1 Page Notes	Human Remains (1 Individual), Documentation	Archaic

L
N
A

[FORSCOM]

Description of Materials	Antiquity/Archaeological Period	Cultural Affiliation	Basis of Determination	Section 5 Materials
Human Remains (1 Individual), Documentation	Archaic	Unknown Native American	Phone Conversation w/Shanon Novack; Physical Anthropologist at Utah Museum of Natural History	All Remains Qualify.

APPENDIX VII

MCX LIST OF REFERENCES

In addition to the references reviewed by MCX personnel at the archaeological site information center, every attempt was made to obtain references cited but not on file. Information taken from these references was coded for data relating to collections made from sites located on installation property (see attached sample of PD-C Bibliographic Data Sheet form) and entered into a data base for ease of manipulation.

Report titles were drawn directly from the title page of reports, and consist of the following fields:

FIELD	DATA ENTERED
Subject Property	Army Installation name
Last Name	Primary author's last name
First Name	Primary author's first name
Middle Initial	Primary author's middle initial
Secondary Authors	Names of secondary authors, <i>or</i> in instances where the author is a company rather than an individual, the company name is listed here.
Title	Title of the reference. For letter reports, the person or agency to whom the correspondence is addressed is listed as the title.
Series	If the report is part of a publication series, the name and number are provided here.
Date	Date of publication or submission
Length	Report length in pages
Contract Number	Contract number and delivery order number, if applicable

The data for the next three fields are drawn directly from the report title page and reflect the hierarchy of contracting agencies involved in accomplishing the work. In some cases, the sponsoring agency is listed as the Army installation; in others, the intermediary contracting agent, (e.g., the Army Corps of Engineers or the National Park Service) is listed as the Sponsoring Agency.

Sponsoring Agency	Agency for which the report was prepared
Contractor	The agent contracted to perform the work
Subcontractor	The agent subcontracted to perform the work

The majority of the citations for archaeological investigations on Army land refer to unpublished reports prepared under contract with federal agencies, consequently the MCX printout was designed to address these reports. In instances where the author is a company rather than an individual, the company name is listed in the Secondary Authors field (due to the length of the field). For published references, the publisher is listed in the Sponsoring Agency field.

Page ____ of ____

Fieldwork
Page ____ of ____

NADB No. _____

PD-C Collection No. _____

PD-C Bibliography Data Sheet

Date: _____

Information obtained by: _____

PD-C Project:

Subject Property:

Repository (name and location):

Record Collection Name/Number:

Report Date and Length (in pages):

Author(s):

Title:

Contractor/Address or Publisher/Address (city, state):

Subcontractor/Address (city, state):

Report Series and Number:

Contract/Purchase Order Number(s):

Sponsoring Agency/Address:

Project Name and Location:

Principal Investigator(s)/Director(s):

Fieldwork Dates:

Type of Investigation (e.g., survey, testing, mitigation):

PD-C Bibliography Data Sheet (continued)

Site Numbers:

Archaeological Period (e.g., Hohokam, Mississippian):

Material Classes (range):

Artifact Collections and Locations:

Approximate Size of Collections (e.g., number of objects):

Record Collections and Locations:

NAGPRA Materials (Check if present)

Human Skeletal Remains _____

Objects

Associated Funerary _____

Unassociated Funerary _____

Sacred _____

Cultural Patrimony _____

Human Skeletal Remains Data Sheet ☐
Number of Attached Sheets _____

Object Data Sheet ☐
Number of Attached Sheets _____

Cultural Affiliation(s):

Basis for Affiliation Determination (e.g., geographic location, burial practices):

Comments:

MCX List of References Fort Douglas, Utah [FORSCOM] as of March 1996

Subject property : Fort Douglas, UT

Last name : Scott

First name : Tom

Middle Initial :

Secondary Authors :

Title : Cultural Resource Summary Report Number WS-88-0420

Series : WS-88-0420

Date : 07/01/88

Length : 3

Contract Number :

Sponsoring Agency :

Contractor : United States Forest Service

Subcontractor :

APPENDIX VIII

NATIONAL ARCHEOLOGICAL DATA BASE REFERENCES FOR FORT DOUGLAS, UTAH

No attempt has been made to edit the National Archeological Data Base format or to correct obvious errors.

Adams, George R.

1974 _Fort Douglas National Register of Historic Places Inventory--Nominatio Form_. Amer. Association for State and Local History, Nashville, TX. Submitted to Unknown.

Anonymous

1962 _History of Ft. Douglas_. Fort Douglas Military Reservation, Salt Lake City, UT. Submitted to Fort Douglas Military Reservation, Salt Lake City, UT.

Pace, Kristi, A. B. Clemensen, and P. Newman

1980 _Cultural Resource Inventory, Fort Gouglas, Utah_. Responsible Organization. Submitted to Responsible Agency. (924586).

Pace, Krista, A. B. Clemensen, and P. Newman

1981 _Cultural Resource Inventory, Fort Douglas, Utah_. Nps, Denver Service Center, Denver, CO. Submitted to Army, Fort Carson, CO.

Scott, Douglas D.

1983 _An Assessment of the Historic Archaeological Potential of Fort Douglas, Utah_. Responsible Organization. Submitted to Responsible Agency.